

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 4, 2003 has been received and carefully noted. By this amendment, claim 11 has been further amended to more clearly particularly point out and distinctly claim the amendment. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are pending in this application and are submitted for consideration.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-9 are allowed over the prior art.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (GB 2330471 A, "Brown"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in Brown.

Claim 10 recites a holographic display including a light source. An Electrically Addressable Spatial Light Modulator (EASLM) is in the path of the light source and is arranged in use to display successively a set of sub-holograms, which together correspond to a holographic image. Light guiding means are arranged to guide modulated light output from the EASLM such that the sub-holograms are displayed successively in respective tiled regions of an EASLM projection surface. An array of lenses are disposed on the output side of the EASLM projection plane, the lenses of the array being aligned with respective tiled regions.

In making this rejection, the Office Action took the position that Brown discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention. However, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the structure of the claimed invention, and therefore, fails to provide the advantages of the present invention. For example, the

holographic display of the present invention is configured to include light guiding means arranged to guide modulated light output from the EASLM such that the sub-holograms are displayed successively in respective tiled regions of an EASLM projection surface. An array of lenses are disposed on the output side of the EASLM projection plane, the lenses of the array being aligned with respective tiled regions.

As a result of the claimed configuration, in the present invention the sub-hologram images on the EASLM projection surface produces discrete sets of wavefronts which converge on object points.

Brown discloses a system for producing a holographic image, Brown employs the use of both an electrically addressed liquid crystal modulator (EASLM) 18 and an optically addressed spatial light modulator (OASLM). As shown in Figure 4 of Brown, the incoherent light source 16 is modulated by the electrically addressed modulator 18. The modulated light 20 passes through the shutter array 28 and lens array 22 to different parts of the optically addressed spatial light modulator 24 in consecutive time frames.

However contrary to the claimed invention, in Figs. 4 and 6 of Brown, the lens array 22 is located before the EASLM projection plane. This means that the lens array 22 is on the input side. Thus, Brown fails to disclose or suggest that an array of lenses are disposed on the output side of the EASLM projection plane, as recited in claim 10. Furthermore, in Figs. 4 and 6 of Brown, there is an OASLM in the EASLM projection plane rather than lenses aligned with the respective tiled regions, as further recited in claim 10.

In sum, as discussed above, Applicants submit that Brown fails to disclose or suggest a holographic display where an array of lenses are disposed on the output side of the EASLM projection plane, the lenses of the array being aligned with respective tiled regions, as recited in claim 10.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 10, is not anticipated within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As claim 11 depends from claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claim 11 incorporates the patentable aspects thereof, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of claims 10 and 11 (claims 1-9 already being allowed), and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

If this application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper,

may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 108347-00014.

Respectfully submitted,  
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN PLLC



Lynne D. Anderson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,412

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Check in the amount of \$420.00

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

LDA/grs

TECH/207462.2